



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

N.K.
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,742	01/23/2001	John Posey	BD46-17	2270

7590 01/29/2003

Michael J. Colitz, Jr.
217 Harbor View Lane
Largo, FL 33770

EXAMINER

WHITE, CARMEN D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NK

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/767,742 Examiner Carmen D. White	Applicant(s) POSEY, JOHN	
--	------------------------------------	--

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Oath/Declaration

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either on an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Karmel* (6,353,743) in view of *Lobb* et al (5,810,680).

Regarding claims 1-3, Karmel teaches a golfing aid system that includes a global positioning system device that pinpoints accurate positions of key landmarks on a golf course; cellular technology device providing mobile phone communication capabilities; a wireless internet link; a radio frequency transceiver for various types of communications on the golf course including with golfers and clubhouse; cellular packet data technology; a portable computer that transmits and receives GPS data; and operating system and software for the data communication (abstract; Fig. 1; Fig. 2; col. 3, lines 4-12; col. 6, lines 35-52; col. 7, lines 17-47). While Karmel teaches as a golf course position location device, Karmel is silent regarding the specific aspects of the device being hand-held with a touch screen. In an analogous golf location device, Lobb teaches a hand held

device with a touch screen that also allows for tracing/input via a stylus (line 12 of abstract; col. 4, lines 52-55). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to incorporate these features of Lobb into Karmel in order to make transportation and input of the data more convenient for the player. Further Lobb and Karmel do not explicitly disclose whether the radio frequency transceivers used in both systems are low power. However it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate this feature into Lobb and Karmel to conserve energy and allow for the use of smaller circuitry.

Regarding claims 4-5, Karmel in view of Lobb teaches all the limitations of the claims as disclosed above. Lobb further teaches the features of allowing the golfer to input and trace course information via a stylus input (col. 10, lines 39-59; col. 4, lines 51-55). While Lobb teaches allowing user input and is functionally capable of allowing any specific type of user input according to various software programming, the reference is silent on the specific feature of prompting the user for a "Yes" or "No" response. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include this feature in Lobb to make it more convenient for the user to make multiple data entries.

Further, with regard to the newly added claim limitation of claims 1-2 and the similarly amended, but worded differently, claim feature of claims 4-5, which recites "with the mapping function allowing a golfer to input data to construct a map of a course by input from the golfer's handheld computer", Lobb teaches the construction of a map

of the user on the golf course using both a stylus for input and GPS technology (col. 4, lines 44-45).

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Remarks

Applicant argues that the instant invention is different from the prior art of record because the instant invention allows the user to construct a map, via GPS technology, while traversing the golf course, as opposed to constructing a map by using a stylus, which Applicant states is taught by the prior art of record. In response to this argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the use of GPS technology to construct a map of the user's travel around the golf course) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Further, as stated in the above claim rejections, Lobb et al teach the use of GPS technology and a stylus input for constructing a map of the user as he/she traverses the golf course.

The examiner appreciates Applicant's amendments to overcome the prior art rejections. However, the claims as currently written do not patentably distinguish over the cited prior art of record, above.

Also, the examiner would like to notify Applicant of the statutory changes made to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Please see the attachment to this office action titled, *Recent Statutory changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)*.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

USPTO Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Carmen D. White whose telephone number is 703-308-5275. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Hughes can be reached on 703-308-1806. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7768 for ***Non-official*** communications and 703-305-3579 for all ***Official*** communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1078.



C. White
Patent Examiner



VALENCIA MARTIN-WALLACE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Recent Statutory Changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

On November 2, 2002, President Bush signed the 21st Century Department of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act (H.R. 2215) (Pub. L. 107-273, 116 Stat. 1758 (2002)), which further amended 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) (Pub. L. 106-113, 113 Stat. 1501 (1999)). The revised provisions in 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are completely retroactive and effective immediately for all applications being examined or patents being reexamined. Until all of the Office's automated systems are updated to reflect the revised statute, citation to the revised statute in Office actions is provided by this attachment. This attachment also substitutes for any citation of the text of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), if made, in the attached Office action.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 in view of the AIPA and H.R. 2215 that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) **the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.**

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 102 prior to the amendment by the AIPA that forms the basis for the rejections under this section made in the attached Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (e) **the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.**

For more information on revised 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) visit the USPTO website at www.uspto.gov or call the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (703) 305-1622.